

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress
1st Session

Vote No. 13

January 11, 1995, 5:22 p.m.
Page S-765 Temp. Record

CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT/Sequesters of Members' Pay

SUBJECT: Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 . . . S. 2. Grassley (for Dole) motion to table the Lautenberg amendment No. 15.

ACTION: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO, 61-38

SYNOPSIS: Pertinent votes on this legislation include Nos. 2-11 and 14.

As introduced, S. 2, the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995, will extend 11 civil rights and labor laws to the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the instrumentalities of Congress.

The Lautenberg amendment would require that Members' salaries be included in any across-the-board sequestration that is mandated under the Budget Act.

Debate was limited by unanimous consent. Following debate, Senator Grassley (for Senator Dole) moved to table the Lautenberg amendment. Generally, those favoring the motion to table opposed the amendment; those opposing the motion to table favored the amendment.

Those favoring the motion to table contended:

Philosophically we have no objection to the Lautenberg amendment. Republicans have proposed similar amendments in the past, including a Grassley amendment barring pay increases for Members until they balanced the budget, and a Helms amendment that required paycuts for Members until such time as they balanced the budget. However, once again, this amendment is not on the subject of the underlying legislation. S. 2 is about making Congress subject to the laws that it subjects the American people to. It will apply 11 laws to Congress that Congress has exempted itself from for nearly 50 years. The Lautenberg amendment, on the other hand, is about punishing Members for irresponsible budgeting.

We Republicans promised the American people swift action on this bill in the last election, and, now that we have won that election in a landslide, we intend to live up to that promise. The Senate has been debating this bill for 5 days; the House passed it

(See other side)

YEAS (61)			NAYS (38)		NOT VOTING (1)	
Republicans (53 or 100%)	Democrats (8 or 17%)		Republicans (0 or 0%)	Democrats (38 or 83%)	Republicans (0)	Democrats (1)
Abraham	Hutchison	Breaux	Akaka	Heflin		Rockefeller- ²
Ashcroft	Inhofe	Byrd	Baucus	Kennedy		
Bennett	Jeffords	Dodd	Biden	Kerrey		
Bond	Kassebaum	Hollings	Bingaman	Kerry		
Brown	Kempthorne	Inouye	Boxer	Kohl		
Burns	Kyl	Johnston	Bradley	Lautenberg		
Chafee	Lott	Lieberman	Bryan	Leahy		
Coats	Lugar	Pell	Bumpers	Levin		
Cochran	Mack		Campbell	Mikulski		
Cohen	McCain		Conrad	Moseley-Braun		
Coverdell	McConnell		Daschle	Moynihan		
Craig	Murkowski		Dorgan	Murray		
D'Amato	Nickles		Exon	Nunn		
DeWine	Packwood		Feingold	Pryor		
Dole	Pressler		Feinstein	Reid		
Domenici	Roth		Ford	Robb		
Faircloth	Santorum		Glenn	Sarbanes		
Frist	Shelby		Graham	Simon		
Gorton	Simpson		Harkin	Wellstone		
Gramm	Smith					
Grams	Snowe					
Grassley	Specter					
Gregg	Stevens					
Hatch	Thomas					
Hatfield	Thompson					
Helms	Thurmond					
	Warner					

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

in less than 1 hour. We do not begrudge our colleagues offering amendments to this bill, but their protestations that they are not trying to delay it by adding extraneous provisions are wearing a bit thin. The Senate has already spent 5 days tabling these often meritorious amendments.

One good result may come from this exercise. Many of the very same Democrats who failed to enact the amendments that have been tabled on this bill when they were in control of Congress are now going on record as supporting them on S. 2. They will thus find it difficult to reject them when they are offered on more appropriate bills in the coming months. The Lautenberg amendment, for instance, should be considered as an amendment to the budget resolution in April. We would be delighted to discuss it on that resolution. For now, though, we urge that it be tabled.

Those opposing the motion to table contended:

When across-the-board budget sequesters are triggered because spending limits have been exceeded, the fault lies with Members of Congress. Members are responsible for making honest budget estimates so as to prevent sequesters. However, even though they are responsible, they do not suffer any ill effects. Instead, the ones who suffer are veterans, senior citizens, students, and all other recipients of government services that are subject to sequestration. The Lautenberg amendment would correct this injustice by removing the current exemption from sequestration for Members' salaries.

We are pleased that our colleagues have not objected to the substance of this amendment. Their objections are merely on its timing. These objections are insupportable. The amendment will not delay Senate passage of this bill, because the Senate has already agreed to a time certain for a vote on final passage, nor do we believe that it will delay enactment because we are certain that the House will gladly accept it. Any fears that the House may wish to discuss the amendment in conference are unfounded.

The Lautenberg amendment is meritorious. It has broad bipartisan support in both Houses, and should be passed without further delay. We therefore oppose the motion to table.